

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JAMES FLOURNOY, P00154293,

Plaintiff,

v.

MARIN COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE, et al.,

Defendant(s).

Case No. [23-cv-02118-CRB](#) (PR)

**ORDER OF DISMISSAL**

Plaintiff, a prisoner at the Marin County Jail (MCJ) facing probation revocation proceedings on prior criminal convictions (as well as pretrial proceedings on new criminal charges in Marin County Superior Court and other jurisdictions) and a frequent litigant in federal court, has filed a pro se complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 claiming denial of due process in connection with his placement and retention in “disciplinary isolation” upon his arrival at MCJ in late December 2022 based solely on his pending criminal charges and not on any sort of prison disciplinary violation. ECF No. 1 (Compl.) at 9. Plaintiff raised the same allegations in a prior prisoner complaint, which was dismissed with leave to amend and after plaintiff filed a timely First Amended Complaint (FAC) on April 21, 2023 is awaiting court screening pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a). See Flournoy v. Marin County, No. 23-cv-00290-CRB (PR) (N.D. Cal. filed Jan. 20, 2023).

A prisoner complaint that merely repeats pending or previously litigated claims may be considered abusive and dismissed under the authority of 28 U.S.C. § 1915A. Cf. Cato v. United States, 70 F.3d 1103, 1105 n.2 (9th Cir. 1995) (citing Bailey v. Johnson, 846 F.2d 1019, 1021 (5th Cir. 1988)) (duplicative in forma pauperis complaint may be considered abusive and dismissed under 28 U.S.C. § 1915). Because plaintiff raised and is litigating the same allegations and claim raised herein in Flournoy v. Marin County, No. 23-cv-00290-CRB (PR), the instant complaint is

1 deemed duplicative and abusive under § 1915A. That plaintiff adds an additional defendant in this  
2 later-filed action does not compel a different result. See Bailey, 846 F.2d at 1021 (complaint  
3 repeating same allegations asserted in earlier case, even if now filed against new defendants, is  
4 subject to dismissal as duplicative).

5 For the foregoing reasons, the complaint is DISMISSED as duplicative under the authority  
6 of 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b) and the clerk is instructed to close the case.

7 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

8 Dated: June 7, 2023



9  
10 CHARLES R. BREYER  
United States District Judge  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28